



PATENT

I hereby certify that on the date specified below, this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

March 1, 2007
Date

Jennifer Badley
Jennifer Badley

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants : W. Daniel Hillis et al.
Application No. : 10/764,340
Filed : January 21, 2004
Title : IMAGE CORRECTION USING A MICROLENS ARRAY AS A
UNIT
Confirmation No. : 5765
Examiner : Martinez, Joseph P.
Art Unit : 2873
Docket No. : 0803-001-004-000000
Customer No. : 44,765

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner For Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

AND AMENDMENT IN RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION

Commissioner for Patents:

This paper is responsive to the Final Office action dated 01 November 2006 ("Office action"), having a shortened statutory period expiring 01 February 2007. Accompanying this response is a petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for extension of time by one (1) month setting a new time for response of 01 March 2007. Further examination and reconsideration are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks set forth below.

Interview Summary begins on page 2.

Amendments to the claims begin on page 3

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

On or around 27 February 2007, the undersigned communicated with Examiner Martinez (hereinafter “Examiner”) by phone regarding text that Examiner used in support of his non-statutory double-patenting rejections. Specifically, the undersigned asked Examiner for clarification of the text reciting “... claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,967,780 to inherently include ...,” that the Examiner used in conjunction with his non-statutory double-patenting rejections of “Claims 31 and 33-35.” See *Examiner’s Final Office Action* pp. 3-4 (01 November 2006).

In the course of this communication, Examiner clarified for the undersigned that Examiner intended to use the foregoing-cited text as a shorthand indication that Examiner saw the objected to claims as more-or-less obvious extensions of the subject matter of “claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,967,780,” which was why Examiner was requesting the terminal disclaimer. Examiner clarified that he did NOT mean to imply any limitation on the scope of “claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,967,780,” and that his remarks were in no way directed toward “claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,967,780”; rather, his remarks were intended to go toward an explanation of the basis on which he was making his non-statutory double-patenting rejections of then-pending “Claims 31 and 33-35” in view of “claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,967,780”. The undersigned thanked and thanks Examiner for this clarification.